

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-10995
Non-Argument Calendar

FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT FEBRUARY 21, 2008 THOMAS K. KAHN CLERK
--

D. C. Docket No. 07-00198-CV-T-26-TBM

L. R. WRIGHT,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida

(February 21, 2008)

Before BIRCH, DUBINA and FAY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

L. R. Wright, proceeding pro se on appeal, appeals the district court's sua sponte dismissal of her pro se "Motion for Relief," which the district court construed as a civil complaint. Wright does not include an argument section in her brief. She lists two "issues" in the brief's "Statement of Issues/Facts/Summary": (1) "TSA staff with disregard, destroyed patrons [sic] carry-on luggages and valuable contents;" and (2) "[p]etitioner seeks monetary damages for necessary medical/legal records evidence and published manuscripts, etc." The brief also includes a "Claim for Losses/Statutory Provisions" section, which reads in its entirety:

Petitioner seeks relief for losses \$591,635.00 plus costs.
Fed. R. C. V. p. (8)a [sic]
Fed. Tort Claims Act 284 § C 52671, et seq.

A copy of the district court's order dismissing Wright's pro se complaint is attached to the brief. Additionally, the notice of appeal states: "I am trying to appeal to this Court on a dismissal." For the reasons set forth more fully below, we affirm.

We decline to review passing references to issues unsupported by argument. Greenbriar, Ltd. v. City of Alabaster, 881 F.2d 1570, 1573 n.6 (11th Cir.1989) (deeming issue waived where party failed to include substantive argument and only made passing reference to the order appealed from). Further, a party may not

“incorporate by reference” arguments presented to the district court, but must specifically and clearly identify the issues presented for review, with citations to the authorities and portions of the record on which the appellant relies. Four Seasons Hotels and Resorts, B.V. v. Consorcio Barr S.A., 377 F.3d 1164, 1167 n.4 (11th Cir. 2004). While we read briefs filed by pro se litigants liberally, Lorisme v. I.N.S., 129 F.3d 1441, 1444 n.3 (11th Cir. 1997), issues not briefed on appeal by a pro se litigant are deemed abandoned, Horsley v. Feldt, 304 F.3d 1125, 1131 n.1 (11th Cir. 2002).

Here, Wright’s brief does not present any argument regarding the district court’s dismissal of the complaint or any other issue. The brief contains no argument section. As noted above, the brief’s “Statement of Issues/Facts/Summary” states two purported issues and a “Claim for Losses/Statutory Provisions” section lists the damages for loss that she seeks and cites the Federal Tort Claims Act. It appears clear from the inclusion of the district court’s order, together with the statement of intent to appeal included in the notice of appeal, that the issue Wright raises on appeal is the propriety of the district court’s dismissal of her complaint. However, the issue is not supported by any semblance of an argument.¹

¹ We note that even if we were to consider the merits of Wright’s appeal, the district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing the complaint because amendment of the

In light of the foregoing, the district court's dismissal of Wright's complaint is **AFFIRMED**.

complaint would have been futile.